

MAY 17 2005

RECEIVED  
FEDERAL ELECTION  
COMMISSION  
SECRETARIAT

**FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**  
**999 E Street, N.W.**  
**Washington, D.C. 20463**

2005 MAY 17 A 9:07

**FIRST GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT**

**SENSITIVE**

MUR: 5562

DATE COMPLAINT FILED: October 12, 2004

DATE OF NOTIFICATION: October 19, 2004

DATE ACTIVATED: February 9, 2005

EXPIRATION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS:  
October 2009

COMPLAINANT:

Democratic National Committee

RESPONDENT:

Sinclair Broadcast Group, Inc.

RELEVANT STATUTES AND  
REGULATIONS:

2 U.S.C. § 431(9)(B)(i)

2 U.S.C. § 434(f)(3)(B)(i)

2 U.S.C. § 441b(a)

11 C.F.R. § 100.29

11 C.F.R. § 100.73

11 C.F.R. § 100.132

INTERNAL REPORTS CHECKED:

None

FEDERAL AGENCIES CHECKED:

None

MUR: 5570

DATE COMPLAINT FILED: October 18, 2004

DATE OF NOTIFICATION: October 25, 2004

DATE ACTIVATED: February 9, 2005

EXPIRATION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS:  
2009 (various dates)

25044120071

COMPLAINANT: Sam Osborne

RESPONDENTS: Sinclair Broadcast Group, Inc.  
Mark Hyman  
Frederick G. Smith

RELEVANT STATUTES AND  
REGULATIONS: 2 U.S.C. § 431(9)(B)(i)  
2 U.S.C. § 434(f)(3)(B)(i)  
2 U.S.C. § 441b(a)  
11 C.F.R. § 100.29(c)(2)  
11 C.F.R. § 100.73  
11 C.F.R. § 100.132

INTERNAL REPORTS CHECKED: None

FEDERAL AGENCIES CHECKED: None

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The complaints in MURs 5562 and 5570 allege, respectively, that Sinclair Broadcast Group, Inc. ("Sinclair")<sup>2</sup> was about to make and made impermissible corporate contributions in connection with certain communications damaging to presidential candidate John Kerry. MUR 5562 alleges that Sinclair was planning to order all of its television stations to air, commercial-free, a film entitled *Stolen Honor: Wounds that Never Heal* ("Stolen Honor"), and MUR 5570 alleges that a local Sinclair-owned station aired "anti-Kerry" comments prior to the general election.

Sinclair, which owns sixty-two television stations, is a publicly traded company.  
[http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Sinclair\\_Broadcast\\_Group](http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Sinclair_Broadcast_Group); <http://www.sbgnet.net>;  
MUR 5562 Response at 1-2; MUR 5570 Response at 2. Approximately ninety-five percent of

<sup>2</sup> Sinclair apparently transferred ownership of most of its television stations to Sinclair Television Group, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Sinclair, on September 30, 2003. Sinclair 2003 Annual Report, at 6. "Sinclair" will refer to both Sinclair Broadcast Group, Inc., and its subsidiaries, including Sinclair Television Group, Inc.

1 Sinclair's stock is reportedly controlled by four brothers, who also serve as directors and three as  
2 corporate officers. [http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Sinclair Broadcast Group](http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Sinclair_Broadcast_Group);  
3 <http://www.sbgj.net>. Sinclair thus does not appear to be owned or controlled by any political  
4 party, political party or candidate, and there have been no allegations to this effect. *Id.*; MUR  
5 5562 Response at 1-2; MUR 5570 Response at 2.

6 As discussed in more detail below, the complaint in MUR 5562 is prospective – in fact,  
7 the broadcast that was actually shown was substantially different than the one challenged – and  
8 the communications that are the focus of the MUR 5570 complaint fall under the media  
9 exemption. Therefore, this Office recommends that the Commission find no reason to believe  
10 that the respondents in either MUR 5562 or MUR 5570 violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a) and close the  
11 files.

## 12 **II. DISCUSSION**

### 13 **A. MUR 5562**

14 On October 9, 2004, the *Los Angeles Times* ran a front-page story reporting that,  
15 according to network and station executives familiar with the plan, Sinclair was ordering its  
16 sixty-two stations – many of them in so-called swing states – to preempt their regular prime-time  
17 programming between October 21 and October 24, 2004, to air *Stolen Honor* commercial-free.  
18 Elizabeth Jensen, *Conservative Group to Air Anti-Kerry Film*, *Los Angeles Times*, Oct. 9, 2004,  
19 at A1. According to the news story, the film, allegedly funded by Pennsylvania veterans and  
20 produced by a veteran and former newspaper reporter, "attacks Sen. John F. Kerry's activism  
21 against the Vietnam war." *Id.* Three days later, or approximately a week before *Stolen Honor*  
22 reportedly would begin airing, relying in part on the *Los Angeles Times* story, the DNC filed a  
23 complaint ("DNC Complaint") with the Commission, alleging that Sinclair was "about to make

25044120073

1 an unlawful corporate-funded electioneering communication and corporate in-kind contribution  
2 to the Bush-Cheney '04 campaign and the Republican National Committee." DNC Complaint at  
3 1.

4 In response, Sinclair maintained that the matter complained of by the DNC is moot  
5 because Sinclair's television stations did not broadcast *Stolen Honor*. MUR 5562 Response at 1-  
6 2. Rather, according to the response, a number of Sinclair's stations "aired an internally  
7 produced news program, entitled *A POW Story: Politics, Pressure and the Media*" ("*POW*  
8 *Story*"). *Id.* The response describes *POW Story* as a program "which discussed and included  
9 segments of [*Stolen Honor*], but which also discussed and presented similarly lengthened  
10 segments from a documentary which was very favorable to Senator Kerry." *Id.* Further, the  
11 response states that *POW Story* "also focused on the controversy surrounding [*Stolen Honor*],  
12 and included interviews of individuals with very disparate opinions about the subject matter of  
13 the news special." *Id.* at 2. Press reports corroborate that no Sinclair television station broadcast  
14 the film *Stolen Honor* and that some aired *POW Story* in the format described in the response.  
15 Frank Ahrens and Howard Kurtz, *Anti-Kerry Film Won't Be Aired*, The Washington Post, Oct.  
16 20, 2004, at A7; CBSNEWS.com, *Sinclair Amends Kerry Film Plans*, Oct. 20, 2004, available at  
17 <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/10/19/politics/printable650030.shtml>.

18 There remains no allegation of prospective or actual wrongdoing before the Commission.  
19 Under these circumstances, the Commission should not speculate whether there might have been  
20 a violation under a set of circumstances that did not occur. *Cf.* Concurring Statement of Reasons  
21 for MUR 5467 (Michael Moore), Smith and Toner, Aug. 2, 2004, at 2-3 (stressing the  
22 importance of "Commission policy not to entertain speculative complaints" in order to "preserve  
23 the integrity of the enforcement process and to focus its limited resources on actual violations of

25044120074

1 the law.”). Accordingly, this Office recommends that the Commission find no reason to believe  
2 that Sinclair Broadcast Group, Inc. violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a) and close the file in MUR 5562.

3 **B. MUR 5570**

4 The complaint in MUR 5570 (“Osborne Complaint”) states that it is “directed toward the  
5 doings” of Sinclair and corporate officers Fred Smith and Mark Hyman, as well as other  
6 unnamed corporate officials who allegedly “have participated in or authorized the illegal use of  
7 corporate funds to affect the 2004 election for the presidency.” Osborne Complaint at 1. The  
8 complaint focuses on several quoted comments concerning Senator Kerry’s presidential  
9 candidacy that it claims were broadcast on KGAN, a Sinclair-owned station, in Cedar Rapids,  
10 Iowa, “[v]ia [Sinclair’s] corporate resources and using Mark Hyman’s office.” *Id.* According to  
11 the complaint, “In conveying its political-attack message, Sinclair uses its Vice President for  
12 Corporate Relations, Mark Hyman (‘Hyman’).” *Id.* The complaint does not list the dates or  
13 times of Hyman’s alleged comments, or the programs or the contexts in which they allegedly  
14 were made.

15 The response, noting the lack of specificity in the complaint, states that Sinclair believes  
16 the comments quoted in the complaint all appeared during KGAN’s news programming. MUR  
17 5570 Response at 1-2. According to the response, thirty-nine of Sinclair’s sixty-two television  
18 stations, including KGAN, regularly broadcast the news, and all statements made by Hyman in  
19 KGAN’s news programming are clearly labeled as commentary during the broadcast. *Id.*

25044120075

25044120076

1 While corporations are generally prohibited from making contributions or expenditures  
2 under 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a), exemptions allow for the broadcast of any “news story, commentary or  
3 editorial” unless the facility(ies) distributing the broadcast are owned or controlled by any  
4 political party, political committee or candidate. 2 U.S.C. § 431(9)(B)(i) and 11 C.F.R.  
5 § 100.132 (regarding expenditures); 11 C.F.R. § 100.73 (regarding contributions)(collectively  
6 “media exemption”). The media exemption also excludes from the definition of electioneering  
7 communication “a communication appearing in a news story, commentary or editorial distributed  
8 through the facilities of any broadcasting station, unless such facilities are owned or controlled by  
9 any political party, political committee, or candidate.” 2 U.S.C. § 434(f)(3)(B)(i); *see also*  
10 11 C.F.R. § 100.29(c)(2). Hence, a news story, commentary or editorial distributed by a  
11 broadcast station not owned or controlled by a political party, political committee or candidate  
12 will not be considered an expenditure, a contribution, or an electioneering communication.

13 According to a press report, Hyman hosts a segment on Sinclair stations. David Zurawik,  
14 *Sinclair editorials labeled as such*, The Baltimore Sun, Dec. 15, 2004, at 1, available at  
15 [www.baltimoresun.com/features/lifestyle/bal-to.sinclair15dec15,0,2751716.story](http://www.baltimoresun.com/features/lifestyle/bal-to.sinclair15dec15,0,2751716.story). That segment,  
16 called “The Point Commentary,” is reportedly a “one-minute daily commentary that is intended  
17 to stimulate public discourse,” and is broadcast on approximately forty of Sinclair’s sixty-two  
18 stations, including KGAN. [www.kgan.com](http://www.kgan.com); [www.newscentral.tv/station/bios/mhyman.shtml](http://www.newscentral.tv/station/bios/mhyman.shtml).  
19 The KGAN website labels the segment an “editorial.” [www.kgan.com](http://www.kgan.com). The available  
20 information suggests that Hyman most likely made the statements during broadcasts of “The  
21 Point Commentary.” If so, the statements fall squarely within the media exemption because they  
22 appear to be “commentary or editorial distributed through the facilities of” Sinclair’s

broadcasting stations. Accordingly, this Office recommends that the Commission find no reason to believe that Sinclair Broadcast Group, Inc., Mark Hyman or Frederick G. Smith violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a) and close the file in MUR 5570.

**III. RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Find no reason to believe that Sinclair Broadcast Group, Inc. violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a).
2. Find no reason to believe that Mark Hyman violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a).
3. Find no reason to believe that Frederick G. Smith violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a).
4. Close the files in MURs 5562 and 5570.
5. Approve the appropriate letters.

5/16/05  
Date

Lawrence H. Norton  
Lawrence H. Norton  
General Counsel

Rhonda J. Vosdingh  
Rhonda J. Vosdingh  
Associate General Counsel  
for Enforcement

Susan L. Lebeaux  
Susan L. Lebeaux  
Assistant General Counsel

J. Cameron Thurber  
J. Cameron Thurber  
Attorney